STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE

FY 2009

UT-BATTELLE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

Management and Operation of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory

September 2008

Approval Page

Thom Mason
President and Chief Executive Officer
UT-Battelle, LLC

Sept. 30, 2008
Date

Johnny O. Moore
Assistant Manager for Science
U.S. Department of Energy

9/30/08
Date

Mark A. Million
Contracting Officer
U.S. Department of Energy

9/30/08
Date

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of UT-Battelle, LLC, (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Performance Expectations," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives—Facility Management Contracts," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." The Total Available FY 2009 Fee is $10,700,000 (Base Fee: $0, Performance Fee: $10,700,000). In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures and Targets (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures/Targets) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Site Office. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the performance-based incentives fee earned (if any) will be determined. As applicable, it also provides information on the award term eligibility requirements.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE

The FY 2009 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2009. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:
The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. For some

targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.

B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:
Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. For the purpose of determining the final Goal grade, the raw numerical score for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point utilizing the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Table B. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing the raw numerical score for each Goal within Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall raw score for each.

As stated above the raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			TBD%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			TBD%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			TBD%		
				Total Score	
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			15%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			30%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			20%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			15%		
				Total Score	

Table A. FY 2009 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**

Table B. FY 2009 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:
The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A above) and then compared to Table C below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2008 as calculated within Table D.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		

Overall Weighted Score from Table A	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

Overall Fee Determination	
Available Fee	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C	
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C	X
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee	

Table D. Final Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned Determination

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination:
The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, DEAR 970.5215-1 – "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount", and DEAR 970.5215-3 – "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts". Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor performance-based grades for each Goal and fee earned

determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Performance Goal achievements.

Determining Award Term Eligibility: (Provide information as applicable)

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY 2009.

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.

The weight of this Goal is TBD%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3). The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Science (SC) (TBD%)
- National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) (TBD%)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (TBD%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (TBD%)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (FE) (TBD%)
- Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) (TBD%)
- Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE) (TBD%)
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) (TBD%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weightings for the remaining HQ Program offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objective 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

A to A+	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
B+	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
B	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
C	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

Objective 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor "guessed right" in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;

- Staff members visible in leadership position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

A to A+	Laboratory staff lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
B^+	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
B	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
C	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

Objective 1.3 Provide and Sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through defined project products, progress reports, statements of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quantity and quality of program/project (e.g., technical reports, policy papers, prototype demonstrations, tasks, etc.) output(s) be it policy, R&D, or implementation programs;
- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer-reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

A to A+	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of work.
B^+	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are universally positive; output(s) meet the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; work demonstrates progress against review recommendations and/or headquarters guidance.
B	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are largely positive, with only a few minor deficiencies and/or slightly negative responses noted; minor deficiencies and/or negative responses have little to no potential to adversely impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify a number of deficiencies and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
D	Most outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals/milestones documented within FWPs and/or other such documents;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises and/or getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and/or responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

A to A+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully met and results anticipate HQ guidance.
B^+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully met and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
B	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are met; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact on the overall program/project.
C	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., less than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project are not corrected.
D	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

Science Program Office[1]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			28%		
1.2 Leadership			24%		
1.3 Output			23%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall FES Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall NP Total	

Table 1.1 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

[1] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	BA Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			TBD		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			TBD		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			TBD		
Office of Nuclear Physics			TBD		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[2]

HQ Program Office[3]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
National Nuclear Security Administration					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall NNSA Total	
Department of Homeland Security					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall DHS Total	

[2] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

[3] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment 1 to this plan. Goal and Objective weightings have been set by the ORO and are preliminary. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the ORO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009, the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall EERE Total	
Office of Fossil Energy					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall FE Total	
Office of Nuclear Energy					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall NE Total	
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall OE Total	
Nuclear Regulatory Commission					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall NRC Total	

Table 1.3 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	BA Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			TBD		
National Nuclear Security Administration			TBD		
Department of Homeland Security			TBD		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			TBD		
Office of Fossil Energy			TBD		
Office Nuclear Energy			TBD		
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability			TBD		
Nuclear Regulatory Commission			TBD		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.4 Overall Performance Goal Score Development[4]

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 1.5 Goal Final Letter Grade

[4] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.4 will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities

The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory research facilities; and are responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is TBD%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Science (SC) (TBD%)
- Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) (TBD%)
- Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE) (TBD%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (TBD)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other applicable program sponsors. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objective 2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information needed to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process.; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B^+, the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
B+	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE appraised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

Objective 2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components;
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

A to A+	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
B+	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
D	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
F	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and
- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

A to A+	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be "leadership caliber" by reviews. Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the "best in class."
B+	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned. Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low and beam delivery or luminosity is well below expectations. The facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
D	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. The facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.

F	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state **and/or** the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

Objective 2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor's efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory's research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;
- Contractor's ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and
- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

A to A+	Reviews document that multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways, that the facility is being used to pursue influential science, that full advantage has been taken of the facility to enhance external user access, and strengthen the laboratory's research base. A healthy outreach program is in place.
B^+	Reviews state strong and effective approach exists toward establishing a large external and internal user community; that the facility is being used for influential science; the laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal scientific capabilities. A healthy outreach program is in place.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of the facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office[5]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			10%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			70%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			20%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			50%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			20%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			90%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
				Overall BER Total	

[5] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment J to this plan.

Office of Fusion Energy Sciences					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			65%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			35%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
				Overall FES Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			85%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			15%		
				Overall NP Total	

Table 2.1 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	BA Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			TBD		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			TBD		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			TBD		
Office of Nuclear Physics			TBD		
				Performance Goal 2.0 Total	

Table 2.2 SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[6]

HQ Program Office[7]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Nuclear Energy					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			100%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
				Overall NE Total	

[6] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

[7] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan. Goal and Objective weightings have been set by the ORO and are preliminary. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the ORO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009, the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			25%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			25%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			25%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			25%		
				Overall OE Total	
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			100%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
				Overall EERE Total	

Table 2.3 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	BA Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			TBD		
Office Nuclear Energy			TBD		
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability			TBD		
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			TBD		
				Performance Goal 2.0 Total	

Table 2.4 Overall Performance Goal Score Development[8]

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 2.5 Goal Final Letter Grade

[8] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.4 will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.

The weight of this Goal is TBD%.

The Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3). The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science (SC) (TBD)
- National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) (TBD)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (TBD)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (TBD)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (FE) (TBD)
- Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) (TBD)
- Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE) (TBD)
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) (TBD)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other applicable program sponsors. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objective 3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
B+	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
B	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who talented in most programs.
C	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
D	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even reasonably talented scientists.
F	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented scientists.

Objective 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and/or user facility strategic plans;
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas).

A to A+	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
B^+	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

Objective 3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

A to A+	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
B+	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt.
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office[9]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			33%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			43%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			24%		
				Overall FES Total	

[9] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Office of Nuclear Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall NP Total	

Table 3.1 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	BA Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			TBD		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			TBD		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			TBD		
Office of Nuclear Physics			TBD		
				Performance Goal 3.0 Total	

Table 3.2 SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[10]

[10] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

HQ Program Office[11]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
National Nuclear Security Administration					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall NNSA Total	
Department of Homeland Security					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall DHS Total	
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall EERE Total	
Office of Fossil Energy					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall FE Total	

[11] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment 1 to this plan Goal and Objective weightings have been set by the ORO and are preliminary Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the ORO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009, the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

Office of Nuclear Energy					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall NE Total	
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall OE Total	
Nuclear Regulatory Commission					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
				Overall NRC Total	

Table 3.3 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	BA Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			TBD		
National Nuclear Security Administration			TBD		
Department of Homeland Security			TBD		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			TBD		
Office of Fossil Energy			TBD		
Office Nuclear Energy			TBD		
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability			TBD		
Nuclear Regulatory Commission			TBD		
				Performance Goal 3.0 Total	

Table 3.4 Overall Performance Goal Score Development[12]

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 3.5 Goal Final Letter Grade

[12] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

4.0 Provide sound and competent leadership and stewardship of the laboratory (15%)

Objective 4.1 Provide a distinctive vision for the laboratory and an effective plan for accomplishment of the vision to include strong partnerships required to carry out those plans (40%)

4.1.1 Assessment of the adequacy of the Laboratory's vision as represented by the Laboratory Agenda

Target: The Laboratory's vision (as expressed by the Laboratory Agenda) is strongly and clearly aligned with DOE missions and shows a clear vision of excellence in science and technology (S&T) capabilities, developing S&T growth opportunities, continuous improvement and innovation in operations, and excellence in community service.

4.1.2 Assessment of the scope and effectiveness of partnerships

Target: The laboratory will cultivate and maintain partnerships necessary to deliver on key mission responsibilities assigned to ORNL. These partnerships are likely to be manifested in cooperative arrangements with universities in support of key programs, technology transfer arrangements utilizing important intellectual property, and shared participation with other institutions and organizations pursuing DOE mission priorities.

4.1.3 Assessment of ORNL's standing in the community

Target: Sustain the laboratory's leadership role as a highly-valued member of the Oak Ridge region through a number of volunteer activities and corporate outreach initiatives.

- Demonstrate ORNL and UT-Battelle's level of corporate and employable charitable giving, including recognition as one of the region's largest employee contributors to the United Way and a host of civic activities such as the symphony, arts center and the Oak Ridge Rowing Association.
- Participate on at least three governing boards of local councils and foundations.
- Provide ORNL speakers, including the Laboratory Director, for public presentations about ORNL's science agenda throughout the region. Coordinate a Public Tours program for DOE facilities.
- Support science education initiatives including the Knoxville's Project Grad Program, UT-Battelle science and math scholarships, and internships for students in the Governor's Academy for Math and Science. Demonstrate a publicity level for ORNL that leads the Department of Energy Office of Science laboratories.

Objective 4.2 Provide for responsive and accountable leadership throughout the organization (30%)

4.2.1 Organizational leadership

Target: The Laboratory's strategic agenda is implemented through the integrated performance management system which aligns resources and actions to the strategic goals through annual institutional performance targets and expectations as documented in the Laboratory Agenda, Organizational Business Plans, and Performance Assessment Plans.

4.2.2 Responsiveness to commitments and effectiveness of actions taken as a result of audits, reviews and assessments

Target: The laboratory will demonstrate timely and thorough response to issues identified in audits, reviews and assessments. Effective corrective actions are identified and completed as scheduled for issues identified by external assessments. The quality of extent of condition assessments and effectiveness reviews will also be evaluated.

4.2.3 Demonstrate responsible cost management performance through achieving responsible General and Administrative (G&A) management

Target: Achieve the G&A rate goal within 0.50 percentage points of the standard rate

4.2.4 Demonstrate improved cost controls for baseline cost components described in 4.2.3 by ensuring cost growth or reduction targets are established, monitored, and managed. Reduction targets will exclude indirect cost components subsequently direct funded.

Target: Effective control of Management System budgets and indirect FTE's, adjusted for changes in business volume.

Objective 4.3 Provide efficient and effective corporate support as appropriate (30%)

4.3.1 UT-Battelle will provide resources to demonstrate its commitment to the success of ORNL.

Target: Consideration will be given to the strategic impact and the effect of support, which may be in any form, such as:

- Enhancing relationships with State and local entities;
- Assuring leadership positions are filled in a timely manner;
- Leveraging agreements with external partners;
- Establishing University partnerships that are aligned with the strategic

objectives of ORNL; and/or

- Providing staff, expert advice, facilitation, management systems, or similar assistance to achieve ORNL objectives, or to assist in the resolution of significant issues.

4.3.2 Successful implementation of contractor assurance system

Target: UT-Battelle Board of Governors (and associated committees) are actively engaged in managing risk and ensuring accomplishment of key performance expectations.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Provide sound and competent leadership and stewardship of the laboratory					
4.1 Provide a distinctive vision for the laboratory and an effective plan for accomplishment of the vision to include strong partnerships required to carry out those plans			40%		
4.2 Provide for responsive and accountable leadership throughout the organization			30%		
4.3 Provide efficient and effective corporate support as appropriate			30%		
				Performance Goal 4.0 Total	

Table 4.1 - Goal 4.0 Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 4.2 - Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade

5.0 Sustain excellence and enhance effectiveness of integrated safety, health, and environmental protection (30%)

Objective 5.1 Provide a work environment that protects workers and the environment (45%)

5.1.1 Achieve DOE-SC goal for reduction of Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) rate (0.25)

Target: DART Rate = 0.25

5.1.2 Achieve DOE-SC goal for reduction of Total Recordable Cases (TRC) rate (0.65)

Target: TRC Rate = 0.65

5.1.3 Execute Effective Safety Leadership Program

Target: The laboratory will continue to execute a comprehensive safety leadership program. Specific goals for FY 2009 include (1) An employee-led safety committee will be chartered with established goals for FY 2009; (2) The Human Performance Improvement (HPI) Working Group will make recommendations to encourage/incentivize employees to challenge unsafe behaviors, especially those involving adherence to established postings and barriers; and (3) Metrics will be developed to evaluate and improve the quality of management observations.

5.1.4 Demonstrate effective management of the 10 CFR 851 Program

Target: Annual update of ORNL Worker Safety and Health (WSH) Program Description is submitted to DOE for approval in accordance with 10 CFR 851. Corrective action and abatement plans as defined in 10 CFR 851 chemical management/fire barrier variance requests and/or Noncompliance Tracking System (NTS) reports are fully implemented. Status is effectively communicated to DOE-ORO.

5.1.5 Maintain doses as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) through effective radiological control of work activities

Target: Maintain the average worker dose for individuals with measurable dose less than 25% of the ORNL ALARA Control Level.

A written ALARA review will be approved before an individual is authorized to exceed 50% of the ORNL ALARA Control Level for an activity associated with a single Radiological Work Permit. No individual exposure that exceeds an anticipated level that triggers reporting under the Occurrence Reporting

Criteria (Group 6-C-3) due to a failure of an administrative/engineering control.

5.1.6 Environmental Stewardship/Compliance with Environmental Requirements. This measure does not include releases, inspection findings, or permit nonconformances, outside ORNL's influence or control, resulting from activities conducted by other DOE prime contractors or tenants of the Science and Technology Park.

Target: 0 reportable releases, 0 significant inspection findings, and a compliance rate with air and water permit requirements, as agreed upon between UT-Battelle and DOE-ORO.

5.1.7 Timely completion of nuclear criticality safety actions identified in DOE approved implementation plan for DOE O 420.1B

Target: Completion of all FY 2009 actions in the implementation plan on schedule.

5.1.8 Demonstrate effective management of the Price Anderson Amendments Acts (PAAA) Program for both nuclear safety and worker safety and health.

Target: The Laboratory's PAAA program will demonstrate self-identification, thorough analysis, comprehensive corrective actions, accurate completion, and timely closure of corrective actions, and mitigation of enforcement actions. Formal extent of condition reviews and root cause analyses will be conducted and documented with a comprehensive set of corrective actions tracked to closure and 100% timely completions.

5.1.9 Occurrence reporting processes effectively address events/incidents promoting continuous improvement and lessons learned. This includes timely and accurate reporting determinations, well developed reports, appropriately developed, implemented and closed corrective actions, and analysis and utilization of occurrence reporting data to initiate process/program improvements.

Target: An Occurrence Reporting and Processing (ORPS) Process Improvement Team will be formed and process improvements will be initiated while still maintaining performance to ensure that the elements of the occurrence reporting system meet both contract requirements and DOE site-specific expectations.

Objective 5.2 Provide efficient and effective implementation of integrated safety, health, and environmental management (40%)

5.2.1 Validation of Environment, Safety, and Health (ES&H) programs through external assessments

Target: Retain Environment, Safety, Health, and Quality (ESH&Q)-related external accreditations along with confirmation of adequacy of ESH programs through FY 2009 DOE-led assessments or other external assessments.

5.2.2 Effective/Efficient Environmental Management System (EMS)

Target: Retain ISO 14001 registrations with 0 major nonconformances, retain EPA Performance Track membership, and maintain EMS that fully conforms to DOE O 450.1

5.2.3 Validation of Environment Safety and Health programs through internal assessments.

Target: Successful completion of key ESH&Q management system assessments that are mutually agreed upon between UT-Battelle and DOE.

Objective 5.3 Provide efficient and effective waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention (15%)

5.3.1 Effective and efficient management of waste accumulation, storage, and disposition activities as measured by:

A. Waste successfully and efficiently dispositioned (a responsibility transferred to ORNL from DOE-EM beginning October 1, 2008)
B. Notifications of non-compliance with Waste Acceptance Criteria requirements from off-site waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDF) utilized for ORNL waste disposition
C. Department of Transportation (DOT) or State/Federal environmental regulatory agency Notices of Violations (NOVs) due to improper management of ORNL waste

Target: Waste generation and disposition data demonstrates the efficient disposition of ORNL waste. Waste accumulation & storage in accordance with applicable time limits (including approved variances). Waste storage usage only where needed to support the efficient management of waste (e.g., efficient waste packaging, load consolidation). All activities performed safely and any NOV(s) received are minor in nature. No waste shipments rejected by TSDF. Any TSDF issues are isolated and do not jeopardize the compliant disposition of future waste streams.

Note: A comparison of ORNL waste generation data with corresponding waste disposition data should demonstrate that no large "waste backlog" is

being created by placement of waste into storage, thereby creating a future legacy.

5.3.2 Effectively implement Pollution Prevention/Waste Minimization program activities throughout ORNL

Target: Timely submittal (including DOE review time) of annual P2/Affirmative Procurement/Award nominations. Continuing evidence of division funded P2 initiatives (similar to years past); improvement in affirmative procurement numbers to 25% (Total Purchases with Recovered Content) and 30% Adjusted Total Content for FY 2008.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
5.0 Sustain excellence and enhance effectiveness of integrated safety, health, and environmental protection					
5.1 Provide a work environment that protects workers and the environment			45%		
5.2 Provide efficient and effective implementation of integrated safety, health, and environmental management			40%		
5.3 Provide efficient and effective waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention			15%		
				Performance Goal 5.0 Total	

Table 5.1 - Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 5.2 - Goal 5.0 Final Letter Grade

6.0 Deliver efficient, effective, and responsive business systems and resources that enable the successful achievement of laboratory missions (20%)

Objective 6.1 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive financial management system (25%)

6.1.1 Systems and processes exist that ensures the financial staff is knowledgeable, possess necessary skills, and maintain adequate level of training to perform the assigned financial management functions.

Target: Implement recommendations of the FY 2008 self-assessment.

6.1.2 Accurate, timely, and complete financial reports are provided to DOE in accordance with Departmental requirements for key activities/deliverables including accelerated financial statement reporting, Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS) submissions, annual budget submissions, and other financial data calls.

Target: Provide DOE the required data on time with minimal error and without the need to re-work. Provide requested data in a timely manner.

6.1.3 Prompt efficiency in the financial operational processes to ensure accuracy of information necessary so financial operations facilitate R&D activities.

Target: No critical delays in financial operation processes [e.g., STARS submissions, Institutional General Plant Projects (IGPP) planning documents, budget formulation and financial statements] due to lack of proper coordination by financial staff.

6.1.4 Adequacy of financial management system and processes as determined by internal audits, A-123 assessments, self assessments and external audits

Target:

- Material findings as identified via audits: Less than two (2) material findings; i.e., material weaknesses in internal controls.
- Audit responses: Respond to audit recommendations in a timely manner.

Objective 6.2 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive acquisition management system (12%)

6.2.1 Effective acquisition and contract management systems as determined by DOE balanced scorecard

Target: The ORNL contracts division meets 90% of the DOE Balanced scorecard goals.

6.2.2 Effective acquisition and contract management systems as determined by DOE stakeholders evaluations results

Target: The ORNL contracts division meets 90% positive responses (rating of meets expectations or above) to a DOE stakeholder evaluation that consists of statement concerning customer satisfaction with communication, the timeliness of response, and the quality of procurement activity and prime contracts management.

Objective 6.3 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive property management system (8%)

6.3.1 Effective property management system as determined by DOE balanced scorecard goals.

Target: The ORNL property management meets 90% of the DOE Balanced Scorecard goals.

6.3.2 Effective property management system as determined by DOE stakeholders evaluation results.

Target: The ORNL property management obtains 90% positive responses (rating of meets expectations or above) to a DOE stakeholder evaluation that consists of statement concerning customer satisfaction with communication, the timeliness of response, and the quality of managing property, materials, and fleet activities.

Objective 6.4 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive human resources management system and diversity programs (15%)

6.4.1 Ensure compensation market competitiveness by maintaining average compa-ratio targets for all job families combined and Scientist and Engineer (S&E) job family

Target:

- Averages are between 0.95 and 1.05

6.4.2 Conduct Health Assessment as part of an overall benefit program management

Target:

- 65% of eligible staff will complete the Health Assessment for the fiscal year

6.4.3 Implement developmental programs for staff and management

Target:

- Deliver one class of 15 pairs in Mentor/Protégé Program with a 90% participant completion rate and a 3.5 average satisfaction rating
- Implement 2 Management Boot Camp Sessions with a 90% participant completion rate and a 3.5 average satisfaction rating

6.4.4 Facilitate cooperative labor-management relationships and foster open communication among stakeholders

Target:

- Obtain timely DOE approval for negotiation parameters
- Negotiate a collective bargaining agreement (CBA), within approved parameters, that is supportive of future operational objectives and mission needs
- Initiate at least two substantive initiatives to enhance cooperative working relationships between labor and management
- Resolve grievances at the lowest level possible

6.4.5 Ensure sound HR systems and processes that are compliant with laws, regulations and policies

Target:

- No significant findings in HR practices, processes, policies and systems as verified by audits and assessments
- Audit 10% of staff performance reviews
- Implement a SAP Recruiting Module (E-Recruit)
- Implementation of Employee Performance Management Tool (EPM)

6.4.6 Provide responsible and accountable leadership that embraces diversity

Target:

- Meet 75% of affirmative action placement goals.
- Collect and provide DOE with semi-annual reports of good faith efforts.

Objective 6.5 Provide efficient, effective and responsive management systems for internal audit and oversight; quality; information management; and other administrative support services as appropriate (30%)

6.5.1 Adequacy of planning and execution of internal audits and timeliness of audit follow-up and resolution

Target:

- 90% of internal audits completed in accordance with the DOE-approved internal audit plan.
- Internal Audit follows up within 60 days of action closure to ensure that the proper resolution of findings was taken by management.

6.5.2 Results of independent assessment of management system feedback and improvement.

An important element of performance assurance and effectiveness of systems is to demonstrate an ability to perform assessments that provide information that monitors our risks and vulnerabilities as well as provide recommendations for decisions that ensure sustainability and continual improvements to the lab's management systems. Two important aspects of system performance are (1) how do systems integrate and adjust as a result of trending and other feedback mechanisms and (2) how systems are deployed by the line organizations.

Target: Successful completion with credible results of an assessment of how selected management systems are managing feedback and process improvement in response to issues identified by trending activities such as occurrence report tracking and/or management trending summaries.

6.5.3 Results of independent assessment of management system deployment.

An important element of performance assurance and effectiveness of systems is to demonstrate an ability to perform assessments that provide information that monitors our risks and vulnerabilities as well as provide recommendations for decisions that ensure sustainability and continual improvements to the lab's management systems. Two important aspects of system performance are (1) how do systems integrate and adjust as a result of trending and other feedback mechanisms, and (2) how systems are deployed by the line organizations.

Target: Successful completion with credible results of a minimum of three assessments of high risk management system deployment areas.

6.5.4 Effective review of line management self-assessment programs, including feedback and improvement, and demonstration of continuous improvement.

Target: Develop a new self-assessment evaluation approach by December 31, 2008, and subsequently perform assessments of four directorates with an annual summary report. This new evaluation program will focus on the evaluation of the assessment plan, risk assessment, adequacy of self-assessments, and improvement impacts.

Objective 6.6 Demonstrate effective transfer of technology and commercialization of intellectual assets (10%)

6.6.1 Indicators of Partnerships performance are in five broad areas: Intellectual Property (IP) Legal, Commercialization, Sponsored Research, Industrial and Economic Development Partnerships, and University Partnerships

Target: Meet Partnerships performance targets as mutually agreed upon (and documented in a detailed plan) between UT-Battelle and DOE-ORO in the key areas of Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, Economic Development and Industrial Partnerships, and Educational Partnerships.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver efficient, effective, and responsive business systems and resources that enable the successful achievement of laboratory missions					
6.1 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive financial management system			25%		
6.2 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive acquisition management system			12%		
6.3 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive property management system			8%		
6.4 Provide an efficient, effective, and responsive human resources management system and diversity programs			15%		
6.5 Provide efficient, effective and responsive management systems for internal audit and oversight; quality; information management; and other administrative support services as appropriate			30%		
6.6 Demonstrate effective transfer of technology and commercialization of intellectual assets			10%		
				Performance Goal 6.0 Total	

Table 6.1 - Goal 6.0 Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 6.2 - Goal 6.0 Final Letter Grade

7.0 Sustain excellence in operating, maintaining, and renewing the facility and infrastructure portfolio to meet laboratory needs (20%)

Objective 7.1 Manage facilities and infrastructure in an efficient and effective manner that optimizes usage, minimizes life cycle costs and ensures site capability to meet mission needs (50%)

7.1.1 Provide efficient and effective maintenance program tools to evaluate maintenance needs and minimize impacts of aging infrastructure

Target: Complete internal mission readiness assessment of ORNL's infrastructure assets required by business lines. Evaluations of these assets are to clearly show and document "condition" (i.e., gaps defined, schedules for needed work, assumptions complete, peer review complete).
NOTE: Grading is based on quality of data, not facilities.

7.1.2 The Laboratory's support of the goals of the Department of Energy's Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative, and the goals and objectives contained in Executive Order 13423.

Target: The ORNL TEAM initiative Executable Plan is issued and approved by DOE on schedule, December 31, 2008, including schedules for the accomplishments of the Energy Conservation Measures (ECMs). The plan adequately addresses the site's contribution to meeting the Agency wide goals of the Secretarial TEAM initiative. ORNL's activities for the Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC) ECMs are accomplished on schedule.

7.1.3 Assessment of the actions completed by ORNL which indicate a current and/or future improvement in energy efficiency

Target: List of activities to be accomplished (based on funding) in FY 2009 provided by October 31, 2008. 85% of projects completed on time.

7.1.4 Effective utilization of funds for management of unneeded materials and chemicals.

Target: List of Unneeded Materials and Chemicals (UMC) activities projected for FY 2010 provided by October 30, 2008. Changes coordinated in a timely manner. Total overhead expenditures on projects included in list exceed $2M. UMC report issued by October 15, 2008, with adequate time provided beforehand for DOE review.

7.1.5 Effective utilization of appropriate funds for excess facility disposition and planning for Integrated Facilities Disposition Project (IFDP) project.

Target:

- Agreed upon list of facilities are accomplished on time. Any work interruptions/violations are minor and do not significantly impact work, cost or schedule. Quality/timely support to IFDP on area of excess facility.
- Quality/timely support provided to IFDP including overall management of UT-Battelle portion of IFDP.

7.1.6 Delivery of risk reduction activities for life cycle work execution.

Target: Agreed upon targeted work activities are performed to ensure current work does not create legacy material.

Objective 7.2 Provide planning for and acquire the facilities and infrastructure required to support the continuation and growth of laboratory missions and programs (50%)

7.2.1 Evidence that the laboratory has a clear vision for future infrastructure needs and has used innovative planning to accomplish that vision

Target: ORNL provides an acceptable Annual Laboratory Plan which identifies and plans for filling performance gaps to ensure the Laboratory's facilities and infrastructure are mission ready to support research strategic objectives.

7.2.2 Effectively manage the Modernization of Laboratory Facilities (MLF) line item project to meet or exceed critical decision milestones.

Target: Achieve CD-2 and CD-3 in accordance with milestones established in the approved Project Execution Plan.

7.2.3 Effectively manage planning base projects to support business line and laboratory operations.

Target: Complete authorized capital projects as defined by project baselines.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain excellence in operating, maintaining, and renewing the facility and infrastructure portfolio to meet laboratory needs					
7.1 Manage facilities and infrastructure in an efficient and effective manner that optimizes usage, minimizes life cycle costs and ensures site capability to meet mission needs			50%		
7.2 Provide planning for and acquire the facilities and infrastructure required to support the continuation and growth of laboratory missions and programs			50%		
				Performance Goal 7.0 Total	

Table 7.1 - Goal 7.0 Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 7.2 - Goal 7.0 Final Letter Grade

8.0 Sustain and enhance the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security management (ISSM) and emergency management systems (15%)

Objective 8.1 Provide an efficient and effective emergency management system (15%)

8.1.1 Conduct a successful annual site exercise during FY 2009.

Target: The exercise demonstrates that UT-Battelle has an effective integrated emergency response capability.

8.1.2 Demonstrate continuous improvement of the emergency management system through implementation of a rigorous lessons learned program.

Target: A systematic process is implemented that demonstrates improvements via lessons learned from the 2008 Full Participation Exercise as well as external reviews.

Objective 8.2 Provide an efficient and effective system for cyber-security (30%)

8.2.1 Ensure all ORNL systems are protected within their appropriate Protection Zone.

Target: All ORNL systems are located/relocated into their appropriate protection zone and their approved firewalls implemented, or an exception is approved in the Device Exception System (DES).

8.2.2 Improve the implementation and maintenance of system firewalls.

Target: Modify the Sensitive Software Registration (SSR) system to automatically implement firewall rules for new/modified systems.

8.2.3 Improve phishing email awareness among ORNL computer users.

Target: Conduct quarterly phishing awareness field tests of ORNL computer users.

8.2.4 Implement classified diskless operations.

Target: Migrate all classified workstations that have not received a waiver to diskless workstations.

Objective 8.3 Provide an efficient and effective system for the protection of special nuclear materials, classified matter, and property (25%)

8.3.1 Maintain adequate security posture in accordance with the Graded Security Protection (GSP) policy – formerly Design Basis Threat (DBT) requirements

Target: Conduct Security Planning and Evaluation (SPAE) meetings to ensure collaboration among site contractors as 2003 DBT implementation is reviewed and in order to implement any changes necessary from the 2008 GSP.

8.3.2 As funding permits, continue to implement new technology that improves security at ORNL

Target: Identify new technology that will continue to strengthen the UT-Battelle Security Program. Initiate at least one request for supplemental funding to implement new security technology.

Objective 8.4 Provide an efficient and effective system for the protection of classified and sensitive information (30%)

8.4.1 Demonstrate proactive actions which instill a culture for prevention of incidents that pose an immediate danger or short-term threat to national security interests and/or critical Department of Energy assets, potentially create a serious security situation, or create high visibility media interest.

Target:

- Develop and distribute a minimum of four site-wide Information Security Articles during FY 2009.
- Conduct a minimum of six Operations Security Program (OPSEC) reviews in FY 2009 and factor in lessons learned to applicable programs/facilities, and if necessary, make adjustments to the ORNL Security program.
- During FY 2009, conduct two performance tests of randomly selected Derivative Classifiers (DC) and factor in lessons learned by the DC program participants.
- Conduct a minimum of four unannounced inspections at Limited Security Area boundaries which focus on the introduction of controlled articles and the removal of classified information.

8.4.2 Implement an effective counterintelligence (CI) program which provides DOE and contractor personnel information and activities with the necessary CI services.

Target: Provide effective training and awareness, operations and investigations, information and technologies and analysis programs that meet DOE CI Assessment Management Plan, FY 2009.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and enhance the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security management (ISSM) and emergency management systems					
8.1 Provide an efficient and effective emergency management system			15%		
8.2 Provide an efficient and effective system for cyber-security			30%		
8.3 Provide an efficient and effective system for the protection of special nuclear materials, classified matter, and property			25%		
8.4 Provide an efficient and effective system for the protection of classified and sensitive information			30%		
				Performance Goal 8.0 Total	

Table 8.1 - Goal 8.0 Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 8.2 - Goal 8.0 Final Letter Grade

Attachment I
Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings
Office of Science

		ASCR	BER	BES	FES	NP
		Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment						
	Goal's weight	**40**	**50**	**30**	**50**	**40**
1.1 Impact (significance)		40	30	50	28	35
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30	20	20	24	25
1.3 Output (productivity) (pass/fail)		15	20	15	23	25
1.4 Delivery (pass/fail)		15	30	15	25	15
Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities						
	Goal's weight	**40**	**25**	**50**	**30**	**40**
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)		10	0	10	65	0
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		10	0	20	35	0
2.3 Operation of Facility		70	90	50	0	85
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community		10	10	20	0	15
Goal 3.0 Program Management						
	Goal's weight	**20**	**25**	**20**	**20**	**20**
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30	20	40	33	40
3.2 Program Planning and Management		40	30	30	43	40
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	50	30	24	20

Attachment I
Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings[13]
All Other Customers

	NNSA	DHS	EERE	FE	NE	OE	NRC
	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment							
Goal's weight	**50**	**50**	**34**	**50**	**45**	**34**	**50**
1.1 Impact (significance)	40	25	25	25	25	25	25
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	20	25	25	25	25	25	25
1.3 Output (productivity) (pass/fail)	20	25	25	25	25	25	25
1.4 Delivery (pass/fail)	20	25	25	25	25	25	25
Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities							
Goal's weight	**0**	**0**	**33**	**0**	**10**	**33**	**0**
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
2.3 Operation of Facility	0	0	100	0	100	25	0
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
Goal 3.0 Program Management							
Goal's weight	**50**	**50**	**33**	**50**	**45**	**33**	**50**
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
3.2 Program Planning and Management	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	33	33	33	33	33	33	33

[13] Goal and Objective weightings have been set by the ORO and are preliminary. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the ORO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009, the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.